



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,900	10/16/2003	Milton B. Maxwell JR.	N9461-ICW	8588
23456 7590 12/09/2008 WADDEY & PATTERSON, P.C. 1600 DIVISION STREET, SUITE 500 NASHVILLE, TN 37203				
EXAMINER				
RAPILLO, KRISTINE K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3626				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/09/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@IPLAWGROUP.COM
BFL@iplawgroup.com

Advisory Action

In regard to claims 1 and 2, the proposed amendments require further search and consideration as it changes the scope of the invention from that previously claimed. Claims 3 – 7 are dependent upon claim 1, thus, the same rationale for claim 1 is applied

In regard to claims 8 and 23, the Applicant argues in substance that the cited references (specifically Goetz) do not teach or suggest the suppression of mild drug-drug interactions. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner interprets a physician override to be an example of suppression of a drug-drug interaction. The claim as written does not explicitly state that the suppression is performed automatically, thus it can be interpreted that the physician may override, or manually, suppress the drug-drug interaction. Claims 9 – 14 and 29 are dependent upon claim 8 and and claims 24 – 28 and 31 are dependent upon claim 23, thus the same rationale for the rejection is applied.

In regard to claim 15 and 18, the Applicant argues in substance that excluding mild drug-drug interactions from profile information is not taught or suggested by Goetz. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner interprets a physician override to be an example of excluding mild drug-drug interaction from the profile information. The claim as written does not explicitly state that the exclusion is performed automatically, thus it can be interpreted that the physician may manually exclude the drug-drug interaction from the profile information. Claims 16 – 17, and 30 are dependent upon claim 15 and claims 19 and 21 – 22 are the dependent upon claim 18, thus the same rationale for the rejection of claim 15 is applied.